

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Office Action of June 14, 2005 has been received and contents carefully reviewed.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 22 and 25, and add new claims 32. Accordingly, claims 1 and 22-32 are currently pending in the present application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 22-31 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,671,022; rejected claims 1 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,668,650); rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. in view of Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,082); rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. in view of Takeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,724,452); rejected claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. in view of Yamamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,657,100); rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. in view of Patel (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,500); and rejected claims 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. in view of Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,776). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

With respect to the double patenting rejection, Applicants do not agree with the double patenting rejection, but in the interest of expediting the prosecution of this application, Applicants herewith submit a Terminal Disclaimer. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mori et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...an auxiliary electrode line electrically connected to at least one of the gate lines in each pixel region, the auxiliary electrode line and the pixel electrode controlling an orientation of liquid crystal molecules of the liquid crystal layer in each pixel

region during an operation of the multi-domain liquid crystal display.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claims 22-23, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. in view of Suzuki et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Because Suzuki et al. fails to cure the deficient teaching of Mori et al., claim 24 is allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. in view of Takeda et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Because Takeda et al. fails to cure the deficient teaching of Mori et al., claim 25 is allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. in view of Yamamoto et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Because Yamamoto et al. fails to cure the deficient teaching of Mori et al., claims 26 and 27 are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. in view of Patel is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Because Patel fails to cure the deficient teaching of Mori et al., claim 28 is allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. in view of Kim et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), subject matter developed by another person which qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) shall not preclude patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 103 where the subject matter in the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same persons or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. The present application and Kim et al. were, at the time of the invention of the present application, made and owned by LG. Philips LCD Co., Ltd. Moreover, the present application was filed after November 29, 1999; and therefore prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is subject to 35 U.S.C. § 103(c). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn as Kim et al. is not

valid prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: October 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By:
Rebecca Goldman Rudich
Registration No.: 41,786
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant